

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

AMRA SABIC-EL-RAYESS,

Plaintiff,

-V-

TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,

Defendant.

24-CV-2891 (JMF)

MEMORANDUM OPINION  
AND ORDER

JESSE M. FURMAN, United States District Judge:

The Court rules on the parties’ latest disputes as follows. First, Plaintiff’s letter motion to compel Defendant Teachers College Columbia University (“TC”) to produce discovery, ECF Nos. 90, 91 (“Mot.”), is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. Specifically:

- Plaintiff's request for discovery on Dr. Erickson's transfer into EPSA is GRANTED.

The Court already ruled that Plaintiff is entitled to discovery with respect to Dr. Erickson. *See* ECF No. 83, at 1-2. The fact that Dr. Erickson may have been transferred into EPSA does not change that ruling and, in any event, does not bear on whether the discovery is relevant within the meaning of Rule 26.

- Plaintiff's request for discovery on Dr. Lor's hiring is also GRANTED. Although there may have been no overlap between Plaintiff and Dr. Lor in EPSA, Dr. Lor's hiring was close enough in time to when Plaintiff sought a position in EPSA to make it relevant.
- Plaintiff's request for the W2s of certain comparators is DENIED, substantially for the reasons set forth in Defendant's response. *See* ECF No. 97, at 2.
- Plaintiff's request to compel Rule 30(b)(6) testimony on Defendant's January and March

2024 rejections of Plaintiff's demand to be placed into a tenure-track position is GRANTED. First, the fact that the demand was made as part of settlement negotiations does not preclude discovery into the issue. *See* ECF No. 71. Second, Defendant's privilege objections are premature; any such objection to particular questions can be made during the deposition. Finally, while depositions of counsel may be disfavored, *see* ECF No. 97, at 3, Defendant need not designate an attorney as its Rule 30(b)(6) witness on the topic.

- Plaintiff's request to compel Rule 30(b)(6) testimony on Topics 18 and 20 is GRANTED, substantially for the reasons set forth in her letter motion. *See* ECF No. 90, at 3. In brief, Plaintiff's revised Notice sufficiently recasts her requests to seek information about facts without requiring Defendant to disclose how those facts support its legal theories.


Second, the Court concludes that there is good cause to extend Plaintiff's deposition, substantially for the reasons set forth in Defendant's letter motion, *see* ECF No. 98, but not for an additional five hours. Instead, Defendant is granted an addition **two hours** of deposition time.

Finally, Defendant's requests to file or maintain certain documents under seal or in redacted form, *see* ECF Nos. 94 and 95, are GRANTED.

The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate ECF Nos. 90, 91, 95, and 98.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 16, 2025  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSE M. FURMAN  
United States District Judge